



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

A

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/774,353	02/06/2004	Harlan M. Hugh	1172/217	5261
26588	7590	11/02/2005		
LIU & LIU			EXAMINER	
444 S. FLOWER STREET SUITE 1750			BOUTAH, ALINA A	
LOS ANGELES, CA 90071				
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
				2143

DATE MAILED: 11/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/774,353	HUGH ET AL.
	Examiner Alina N. Boutah	Art Unit 2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 February 2004.

2a) This action is FINAL.                            2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Specification***

The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Borgida et al. (hereinafter referred to as Borgida) in view of USPN 6,236,994 issued to Swartz et al. (hereinafter referred to as Swartz).

Regarding claim 1, Borgida teaches a method for monitoring information in a knowledgebase framework, comprising the steps of:

- (c) receiving information relating to a target to be tracked from a user utilizing a network (Abstract, col. 5, lines 31-34; col. 11, lines 36-46);
- (d) monitoring the network for changes to the target (Abstract; col. 11, lines 15-17);
- (e) retrieving data relating to the monitored changes (col. 11, lines 36-46); and

(f) transmitting the retrieved data to the user utilizing the network (col. 11, lines 36-46).

However, Borgida fails explicitly teach (a) obtaining information from at least one data source utilizing a network; (b) generating a knowledge model-based index for the obtained information as a function of a knowledge model, where the knowledge model includes a plurality of categories, where each of the plurality of categories is interrelated to at least a respective one of the plurality of categories; and (c) receiving information relating to a target to be tracked in the knowledge model-based index from a user utilizing a network.

Swatz teaches: (a) obtaining information from at least one data source utilizing a network (col. 4, lines 2-5);

(b) generating a knowledge model-based index for the obtained information as a function of a knowledge model, where the knowledge model includes a plurality of categories, where each of the plurality of categories is interrelated to at least a respective one of the plurality of categories (col. 3, lines 6-9; col. 19, lines 30-35); and

(c) receiving information relating to a target to be tracked in the knowledge model-based index from a user utilizing a network (col. 6, lines 22-25).

At the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teaching of Borgida and Swatz by obtaining information from data sources in order to create a knowledge-based system, and employing a knowledge model-based index for the obtained information in order to enable easy access to the obtained data, thus enabling a more efficient use of the knowledge system.

Regarding claim 2, Borgida teaches a method as recited in claim 1, wherein the target comprises at least one of: a publication, a person, a therapeutic area, a disease, a biological target, an organization, a compound, a patent, and a drug (figure 7).

Regarding claim 3, Borgida teaches a method as recited in claim 1, further comprising the step of storing the received information in memory (col. 5, lines 30-38).

Regarding claim 4, Borgida teaches a method as recited in claim 1, further comprising the step of: receiving an indication that the user has logged on the network, and wherein the retrieved data is transmitted to the user after receipt of the indication (Abstract; col. 13, lines 57-62).

Regarding claim 5, Borgida fails to teach a method and a computer program as recited in claim 1, wherein a pharmaceutical database is monitored for changes relating to the target. Swartz teaches monitoring a pharmaceutical database for changes (Abstract; col. 3, line 43; col. 6, lines 23-24). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to monitor a pharmaceutical database for changes in order to enable a more efficient use of the knowledgebase information (Abstract).

Regarding claim 6, Borgida teaches a method as recited in claim 1, further comprising the step of alerting the user that a change to the target has been monitored utilizing a network (col. 11, lines 36-46).

Regarding claim 7, Borgida teaches a method as recited in claim 1, further comprising the steps of permitting the user to input a search term utilizing the network, searching for items associated with the search term, and displaying items associated with the search term to the user utilizing the network (col. 1, line 66- col. 2, line 3).

Regarding claim 8, Borgida teaches systems (network) that monitor changes in the network (Abstract). Borgida fails to expressly teach the network comprising an intranet of an organization and the Internet. Swatz teaches the network comprising an intranet and internet (col. 2, lines 52-55).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to enable the network to comprise an intranet and Internet in order for users to be able access data in the network inside and outside of network, thus maximizing the network efficiency.

Claims 9-16 have similar limitation as claims 1-8, respectively, therefore are rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 17 has similar limitation as claim 1 therefore is rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 18 is similar to claim 4, therefore is rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding claim 19, Borgida teaches a method for monitoring information in a knowledgebase framework, comprising the steps of:

- (e) receiving information relating to a target to be tracked from a user utilizing a network (Abstract, col. 5, lines 31-34; col. 11, lines 36-46);
- (f) monitoring the network for changes to the target (Abstract; col. 11, lines 15-17);
- (g) retrieving data relating to the monitored changes (col. 11, lines 36-46); and
- (h) transmitting the retrieved data to the user utilizing the network (col. 11, lines 36-46).

However, Borgida fails to expressly teach the steps of: (a) obtaining a plurality of data records from at least one data source utilizing a network; (b) generating a knowledge model-based index for the data records as a function of a knowledge model, where the knowledge model includes a plurality of categories, where each of the plurality of categories is interrelated to at least a respective one of the plurality of categories, where each of the data records is associated with at least one of the plurality of categories; (c) generating a graphical user interface of the knowledge model, where the graphical user interface is operable to display at least one of the plurality of categories, where the graphical user interface is further operable to display a link to a respective data record associated with a respective one of the plurality of categories; and (d) allowing a user to browse the plurality of categories and the data records associated with the categories.

Swatz teaches the steps of: (a) obtaining a plurality of data records from at least one data source utilizing a network (col. 4, lines 2-5);  
(b) generating a knowledge model-based index for the data records as a function of a knowledge model, where the knowledge model includes a plurality of categories, where each of

the plurality of categories is interrelated to at least a respective one of the plurality of categories, where each of the data records is associated with at least one of the plurality of categories (col. 3, lines 6-9; col. 19, lines 30-35);

- (c) generating a graphical user interface of the knowledge model, where the graphical user interface is operable to display at least one of the plurality of categories, where the graphical user interface is further operable to display a link to a respective data record associated with a respective one of the plurality of categories (figures 6-17); and
- (d) allowing a user to browse the plurality of categories and the data records associated with the categories (figures 6-17).

At the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teaching of Borgida and Swatz by obtaining information from data sources in order to create a knowledge-based system, and employing a knowledge model-based index for the obtained information in order to enable easy access to the obtained data, thus enabling a more efficient use of the knowledge system.

Regarding claim 20, Borgida fails to teach the method of claim 21, where the target comprises a respective category. Swatz teaches the target comprising a respective category (figures 6-17). At the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teaching of Borgida and Swatz by obtaining information from data sources in order to create a knowledge-based system, and employing a knowledge model-based index for the obtained information in order to enable easy access to the obtained data, thus enabling a more efficient use of the knowledge system.

Regarding claim 21, Borgida fails to teach the method of claim 21, where the target comprises a respective data record. Swatz teaches the target comprising a respective data record (figures 6-17). At the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teaching of Borgida and Swatz by obtaining information from data sources in order to create a knowledge-based system, and employing a knowledge model-based index for the obtained information in order to enable easy access to the obtained data, thus enabling a more efficient use of the knowledge system.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alina N. Boutah whose telephone number is 571-272-3908. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (9:00 am - 5:00 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on 571-272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 10/774,353

Page 9

Art Unit: 2143

*ANB*

ANB



DAVID WILEY  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100